

**Amendments to the Drawings**

Replacements drawings are being filed in response to the Examiner's objection that the drawings as filed were not clear.

Attachment: Replacement Sheet(9)

## **REMARKS**

Applicant has received and reviewed an Office Action dated July 6, 2007. By way of response, Applicant has canceled claim 17 without prejudice and amended claims 13-16. No new matter is presented. Claims 13-16 are pending. Applicant submits that the pending claims are supported by the specification.

For the reasons given below, Applicant submits that the amended claims are in condition for allowance and notification to that effect is earnestly solicited.

## **Drawings**

The Examiner objected to the drawings asserting they were not clear. Applicants provided the Undersigned Representative with replacement drawings, which are submitted herewith to address this objection.

## **Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 112, First Paragraph**

The Examiner rejected claims 16 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph. The Examiner objected to wording in the claim. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Nonetheless, solely to advance prosecution of the application and not to acquiesce to the rejection, Applicants have amended claim 16. Claim 16 no longer includes the language objected to by the Examiner.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that the claims fully comply with § 112, first paragraph, and withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

## **Rejection of Claims Under 35 U.S.C. § 112, Second Paragraph**

The Examiner rejected claims 13-17 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph. The Examiner objected to certain terms and phrases in the claims. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Nonetheless, solely to advance prosecution of the application and not to acquiesce to the rejection, Applicants have amended claim 13-15. The claims no longer include the language objected to by the Examiner.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that the claims fully comply with § 112, second paragraph, and withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

**Rejection of Claims Under 35 U.S.C. §§ 102(b) and 103(a)**

The Examiner rejected claims 13 and 15-16 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as anticipated by Maehara, US 6,186,294. The Examiner rejected claim 17 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as obvious over the Maehara reference. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Applicants respectfully submit that the assembly disclosed in the Maehara reference has a pivoted lever for moving the valve for controlling the brake fluid to the wheel cylinder to provide stable braking characteristics. In contrast, the configuration of the claimed brake assembly is configured so that the lever multiplies the force input to the leading shoe and give advantageously high force output with respect to the shoe factor.

Accordingly, based on the foregoing differences, Applicants respectfully submit that the Maehara reference neither teaches nor suggests the presently claimed brake assembly, and withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

**Summary**


In view of the above amendments and remarks, Applicant respectfully requests a Notice of Allowance. If the Examiner believes a telephone conference would advance the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the below-listed telephone number.

Please charge any additional fees or credit any overpayment to Merchant & Gould P.C., Deposit Account No. 13-2725.

Respectfully submitted,

MERCHANT & GOULD P.C.  
P.O. Box 2903  
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402-0903  
(612) 332-5300

Date: 6 Dec 107

  
Mark T. Skoog  
Reg. No. 40,178

MTS:kf